



圖例 NOTATION

ZONES	地帶	
COMMERCIAL	C	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	R(A)	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	R(B)	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	R(C)	住宅 (丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)	R(E)	住宅 (戊類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	G/C	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途
COMMUNICATIONS	交通	
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)	[Symbol]	鐵路及車站 (地下)
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	[Symbol]	主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD	[Symbol]	高架道路
RAILWAY RESERVE	[Symbol]	鐵路專用範圍
MISCELLANEOUS	其他	
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	[Symbol]	規劃範圍界線
LAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION/URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN AREA	[Symbol]	土地發展公司/市區重建局發展計劃範圍
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	[Symbol]	建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	[Symbol]	最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	[Symbol]	最高建築物高度 (樓層數目)
PETROL FILLING STATION	P F S	加油站
NON-BUILDING AREA	NBA	非建築用地

土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMMERCIAL	20.47	22.95	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	13.59	15.24	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	1.70	1.91	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	0.35	0.39	住宅 (丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)	0.27	0.30	住宅 (戊類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	10.52	11.80	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	3.94	4.42	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	6.38	7.15	其他指定用途
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	29.82	33.44	主要道路等
LAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION/URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN AREA	2.14	2.40	土地發展公司/市區重建局發展計劃範圍
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	89.18	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第7條展示。
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

草圖編號 S/H 5/27 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/H5/27

按照城市規劃條例第7條展示的修訂 AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

修訂項目 A 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A	修訂項目 E 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E4	修訂項目 F 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM F1
修訂項目 B 項 AMENDMENT ITEM B	修訂項目 F 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM F2	修訂項目 G 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM G1
修訂項目 C 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C	修訂項目 G 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM G2	修訂項目 E 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E1
修訂項目 D 項 AMENDMENT ITEM D	修訂項目 G 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM G3	修訂項目 E 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E2
修訂項目 E 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E1		修訂項目 E 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E3

(參看附表) (SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2018年5月4日 按照城市規劃條例第7條展示的草圖編號 S/H5/27 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/H5/27 EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 4 MAY 2018

Ms Jacinta K. C. Woo 胡潔貞女士
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的灣仔 (港島規劃區第5區) 分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 5 - WAN CHAI - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 比例尺
0 200 400 600 800 METRES 米

規劃署遵照城市規劃委員會指示備
PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號 PLAN No. S/H5/28

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE DRAFT WAN CHAI OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H5/27
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Commercial” (“C”) zones bounded by Johnston Road to the north and Tonnochy Road to the west, and the “C” zone bounded by Hennessy Road to the south and Percival Street to the west from 130mPD to 135mPD.
- Item B – Revision of the building height restriction for the “C(4)” zone at Jaffe Road/Lockhart Road from 80mPD to 110mPD.
- Item C – Revision of the building height restriction for the sub-area (b) of the “C(6)” zone at Wing Fung Street from 120mPD to 135mPD.
- Item D – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” zones bounded by Wan Chai Road, Morrison Hill Road, Canal Road West and Hennessey Road from 110mPD to 135mPD.
- Item E1 – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone to the south of Queen’s Road East from 100mPD to 110mPD.
- Item E2 – Revision of the building height restriction for the “R(A)” zone at 21-23A Kennedy Road from 120mPD to 140mPD.
- Item E3 – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group B)” zone at Monmouth Terrace from 140mPD to 150mPD.
- Item E4 – Revision of the building height restriction for the “R(A)” zone and “R(A)5” zone at Oi Kwan Road from 90mPD to 110mPD.
- Item F1 – Deletion of the non-building area requirement on the two sides of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Hotel, Commercial, Community and/or Cultural Uses” zone at Gloucester Road/Jaffe Road and stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys for the areas concerned.
- Item F2 – Deletion of the non-building area requirement on the two sides of the “C(4)” zone at Jaffe Road/Lockhart Road and stipulation of building height restriction of 110mPD for the areas concerned.
- Item G1 – Deletion of the building gap requirement on the two sides of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone of Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building at 225 Hennessy Road and revision of the building height restriction from 19mPD to 12 storeys for the areas concerned.

- Item G2 – Deletion of the building gap requirement on the side of the “G/IC” zone of Hennessy Road Government Primary School at 169 Thomson Road and revision of the building height restriction from 19mPD to 8 storeys for the area concerned.
- Item G3 – Deletion of the building gap requirement to the “R(A)” zone at parts of sites at 93-99 and 101 Wan Chai Road and revision of the building height restriction from 19mPD to 110mPD for the area concerned.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the minor relaxation clause in the Remarks of the Notes for the “C” zone to reflect the deletion of the non-building area requirement on the two sides of the “C(4)” zone.
- (b) Deletion of the Remarks of the Notes for “R(A)” zone requiring the provision of building gap to the parts of sites at 93-99 and 101 Wan Chai Road.
- (c) Deletion of the Remarks of the Notes for “G/IC” zone requiring the provision of building gaps of the Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building Site at 225 Hennessy Road and Hennessy Road Government Primary School Site at 169 Thomson Road.
- (d) Deletion of the Remarks of the Notes for “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Hotel, Commercial, Community and/or Cultural Uses” zone requiring the provision of non-building areas.
- (e) Revisions to the exemption clause on maximum gross floor area/maximum plot ratio in the Remarks of the Notes for the “Residential (Group C)” zone and “Residential (Group E)” zone to clarify that exemption of caretaker’s quarters and recreational facilities are only applicable to those facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building.

Town Planning Board

4 May 2018

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/27

(TPB Paper No. 10415)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

72. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were formulated upon review of the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in order to give effect to the Court's orders in respect of two judicial reviews (JRs) lodged by the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA) and by Leighton Property Company Limited and Lee Theatre Realty Limited (LTT), both were subsidiaries of Hysan Development Co. Ltd (Hysan). The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Wan Chai area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with Hysan:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with Hysan |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - had past business dealings with Hysan |
| Mr David Y.T. Lui | - co-owning with spouse a flat at Star Street |
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - her company owning an office at Queen's Road East, Wan Chai |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - his office is located at Southorn Centre, Wan Chai |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu |] Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some |
| Mr L.T. Kwok |] of their projects before |
| Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong |] |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - being an ex-Executive Director and committee member of The Boys' & Girls' |

Clubs Association of Hong Kong and Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of the activities of the association before; and her spouse serving an honorary post at Ruttonjee Hospital

73. Members noted that Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Mr David Y.T. Lui had already left the meeting and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had not yet arrived at the meeting. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Stephen L.H. Liu had no involvement in Hysan's sites and the interests of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu, Mr L.T. Kwok, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were remote/indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

74. Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

75. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong
(DPO/HK), PlanD

Mr Anthony K.O. Luk - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK),
PlanD

76. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

77. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the proposed amendments, including their background, the general implications of the Sustainable Building Design Guideline (SBDG) on building profile, the building height (BH) concept on the current OZP, the proposed BH restrictions (BHRs), review of air ventilation measures, visual and urban design considerations, government's responses to REDA and LTT's original representations and the proposed amendments to the

OZP as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10415 (the Paper). The review of BHRs had been conducted for all commercial, “Residential (Group A)”, Residential (Group B)”, “Residential (Group E)” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(Mixed Use)”) zones. For “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Residential (Group C)” and other “OU” zones, they were not included in this round of review.

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the presentation of DPO/HK, PlanD]

78. The Chairperson said that the review of the draft Wan Chai OZP was to give effect to the orders of the Court subsequent to two JRs and related appeals allowed by the Court, which required the Board’s decisions on the representations submitted by REDA and LTT in respect of the draft OZP No. S/H5/26 be remitted to the Board for reconsideration. According to the judgments, while the Court held that the Board had power to impose development restrictions including BHRs, non-building area (NBA), building gap (BG) and setback (SB) requirements on statutory plans, the general implications of the SBDG on the development intensity of the sites had not been duly taken into account by the Board in making the previous decisions on the said representations. She continued to say that taking into account the relevant Court judgments and upon review of the subject OZP based on the same approach adopted for other OZPs also subject to the court decisions, PlanD had proposed amendments to the development restrictions on the OZP. The Board was invited to consider whether those proposed amendments were suitable for publication under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO). Subject to the agreement of the Board, the amended OZP incorporating the proposed amendments would be published for public inspection and the stakeholders and the general public could make representations and comments in accordance with the relevant provisions of the TPO at a later stage. She then invited questions and comments from Members.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

Imposition of Development Restrictions

79. A Member enquired about the legal basis for imposing development restrictions on the OZP. In response, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning (D of Plan), said that pursuant to section 3 and 4 of the TPO, the Board could undertake the systematic preparation of

draft plans for the lay-out of such areas of Hong Kong and make provision for different land uses as well as types of building suitable for erection therein. In that regard, the Court had held in a number of JRs and related appeals that it was within the power of the Board to impose development restrictions including BHRs, NBA, BG and SB requirements on statutory plans.

BHRs

80. A Member asked whether there was any plan to review the BHRs of the government, institution and community (GIC) sites. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that GIC developments had specific functional and design requirements to suit their operational needs. For example, there was standard design for school developments which was of eight storeys. Since the GIC clusters in Wan Chai, particularly in the Morrison Hill area, had provided spatial and visual relief amidst the densely built environment, their current BHRs were proposed to be maintained mainly to reflect their existing BHs as recommended by the air ventilation assessments undertaken in 2010 and 2018. As there had been no substantial change in the planning circumstances since the OZP review in 2010 and in accordance with the same approach adopted for the review of other OZPs subject to court decisions, a general review of the BHRs for the “G/IC” zone was considered not necessary at the current stage. Should there be any known or committed development or redevelopment proposals with policy support for individual GIC sites, the BHRs of the concerned sites could be revised accordingly.

Development Intensity

81. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) for those sites where the maximum plot ratio (PR) or gross floor area (GFA) was not stipulated on the OZP, what the basis of control on development intensity was; and
- (b) whether the proposed relaxation of BHRs would have any implication on development intensity and traffic impact.

82. In response to Members’ questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau and Mr Raymond K.W. Lee made the following main points:

- (a) for those sites with no maximum PR/GFA stipulated on the OZP, their development intensity was subject to the control under the Buildings Ordinance; and
- (b) under the OZP review in 2010, a number of development restrictions including BHRs, NBA, BG and SB requirements had already been incorporated into the Wan Chai OZP. The proposed amendments under consideration by the Board were premised upon a review of those development restrictions in response to the Court's ruling that SBDG was a relevant consideration in formulating the restrictions, and on the basis of revised assumptions. The proposed amendments did not involve any changes to the permissible development intensity, and hence the traffic implications should remain the same.

Air Ventilation

83. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the air ventilation impact of the development restrictions on a 3-dimensional basis had been assessed;
- (b) whether the proposed relaxation of BHRs had allowed flexibility for building design measures such as elevated podium and sky garden for improving air penetration and urban porosity;
- (c) noting that some NBA/BG requirements were proposed to be deleted, whether the adoption of SBDG measures in individual sites were sufficient to serve the air ventilation objectives in a wider context; and
- (d) why the NBAs and BGs between Fleming Road and Stewart Road were proposed to be deleted.

84. In response to Members' questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint Slides and the visualiser:

- (a) the Wan Chai District was characterised by high development density with tall buildings and narrow streets. In general, given the high BH to street width (H/W) ratio of up to about 1 to 4, it was difficult for the wind from the roof top level to reach the street level and BH would not be the key consideration for the pedestrian wind environment of the area. While a general increase in BH for the commercial, mixed uses and residential sites on the OZP would further elevate the already high urban canopy, the adoption of SBDG's design measures in future would enhance building permeability, particularly around the low zone. Together with the existing and future wind penetration along major air paths following the road network and open areas, impact of the wind shadow on the pedestrian wind environment would be alleviated;
- (b) based on the revised assumptions set out in Annex E of the Paper, the BHRs on the OZP had been reviewed to ensure that they were generally sufficient to accommodate the development intensity permitted under the OZP while allowing certain flexibility for the incorporation of design elements including SBDG to improve the overall built environment;
- (c) during the OZP review in 2010, a stepped BH concept with height bands of 20m increments had been introduced in the Wan Chai area to facilitate downwash effect. Given the high development density of the area with high concentration of tall buildings and narrow streets, further increase in the variation of BHRs and/or widening of streets to facilitate air penetration might be impractical;
- (d) should there be any development/redevelopment proposal adopting good building design measures resulted in an exceedance of BHR, minor relaxation of the BHR might be considered by the Board upon application under section 16 of the TPO. Each case would be considered based on its individual merits;
- (e) while the general wind environment of the city would be improved in the long run when the number of redeveloped buildings following SBDG increased

gradually, the beneficial effect of SBDG measures could be localised. As such, the imposition of NBA/BG requirements at strategic locations was still necessary to maintain major air paths or create inter-connected air paths of district importance. For those NBAs and BGs which would not serve as district air paths in the area, they were proposed to be deleted; and

- (f) in the extant draft OZP, NBAs were designated along the eastern and western boundaries of the Ex-Wan Chai Police Station site, Ex-Wan Chai Police Married Quarter site, and BGs were imposed on the eastern and western boundaries of the Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building site and the eastern boundary of the Hennessy Road Government Primary School site so as to break up the line of building blocks along those streets upon redevelopment to facilitate some penetration of sea breeze and localised air movement. However, the wind entrance to these air paths had been partially blocked by the existing high-rise developments to the north, and might not be able to serve as district air paths in the area. Upon reviewing the OZP and the air ventilation measures, it was recognised that there were alternative building design measures including SBDG that could serve similar air ventilation purpose for the locality. Given that all the concerned sites were under government control, consideration could be given to incorporating building design measures under SBDG in the future land sale documents and/or development/redevelopment proposals to facilitate wind penetration in the north-south direction.

Review of Other OZPs

85. Some Members asked whether other OZPs with BHRs and NBA/BG/SB requirements imposed would also be subject to review. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that PlanD would progressively review other OZPs with BHRs and NBA/BG/SB requirements imposed. While priority would be accorded to those OZPs which were subject to court decisions, other OZPs with BHRs and NBA/BG/SB requirements imposed would also be reviewed when opportunity arose subject to availability of resources. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan, supplemented that in the interim, should there be any development or redevelopment proposals which had exceeded the BHRs on the OZPs after incorporating SBDG's design measures, there were provisions for application for minor relaxation of the BHRs under section

16 and amendments to the OZPs under section 12A of the TPO. Those applications would be considered by the Board based on individual merits.

Visual Impact

86. A Member asked whether the ridgeline behind Wan Chai would be preserved and whether the proposed relaxation of BHRs would protrude into the ridgeline.

87. In response to the Member's questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following main points with the aid of PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the Urban Design Guidelines promulgated in 2003, the main goal of BH profile was to protect and enhance the relationship of the city and its natural landscape context, particularly to its ridgelines/peaks. In order to preserve views to ridgelines/peaks and mountain backdrop with recognised importance around Victoria Harbour, for any new development/redevelopment proposals, a 20% building free zone below the ridgelines would need to be maintained when viewing from a number of key and popular vantage points;
- (b) as shown in the photomontages (Plans 9A and 9C) prepared based on the key vantage points from Tsim Sha Tsui (Hong Kong Cultural Complex) and Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Park, the proposed BHRs would not affect the views to the ridgelines to be preserved nor protrude into the 20% building free zone; and
- (c) as for the views from other vantage points such as the West Kowloon Cultural District (photomontage in Plan 9B), the view of the ridgeline would also not be affected as the revised BHRs would still be lower than most of the existing buildings in the area.

88. The Chairperson summed up the discussion and said that subject to the agreement of the Board, the OZP incorporating the proposed amendments would be published under section 7 of the TPO. The stakeholders and the public could submit representations on the OZP to the Board during the statutory plan exhibition period. Any representation received would be considered according to the provision of the TPO.

89. After deliberation, the Board agreed:
- (a) that the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/27A at Annex B1 of TPB Paper No. 10415 (to be renumbered as S/H5/28 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex B2 of TPB Paper No. 10415, drawn up based on the proposed amendments to the draft Wan Chai OZP, were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the TPO; and
 - (b) to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Annex B3 of TPB Paper No. 10415 for the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/27A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the draft OZP.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:00 p.m.]

Action

~~33. Mr TO Chi-hung of WSD replied that the waterworks at Fenwick Street were tunnel boring works, which had to be conducted at the tunnel portal. The works were expected to be completed in the third quarter of 2018.~~

34. Members asked the Drainage Services Department (DSD) about the progress of the drainage enhancement works in Wan Chai. They commented that the performance of the drainage system in rainy days was unsatisfactory, and asked whether DSD would carry out sewerage and drainage improvement works in Wan Chai.

35. Mr Evan HO of CEDD stated that he had no information about the sewerage and drainage improvement works in Wan Chai, but he would relay the opinions of Members to DSD after the meeting.

36. The Chairperson asked the Secretary to invite DSD's representatives to future meetings to answer Members' enquires about the works of DSD, and she thanked the representatives of WSD and AECOM for attending the meeting.

(Representatives of WSD and AECOM left the meeting after discussion.)

~~(Co-opted Member Ms LAU Pui-shan joined the meeting at 3:10 p.m.)~~

Item 6: Amendments Incorporated into the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28
(DPTC Paper No. 40/2018)

37. The Chairperson welcomed Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer/HK of the Planning Department (PlanD), to the meeting.

38. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD drew Members' attention to the following three points prior to the detailed introduction of the amendments incorporated into the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28 (the OZP):

- i. The amendments were the results of the review on the planning restrictions of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28 conducted in the light of the recent Court's rulings on two judicial reviews on the OZP.
- ii. The amendments did not involve any changes to the land use zonings or the plot ratio.
- iii. The amendments mainly concerned building height restrictions (BHRs), and non-building area (NBA) and building gap (BG) requirements.

39. Mr Anthony LUK of PlanD briefed Members with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation on the amendments incorporated into the OZP.

40. Members asked whether there was any increase in the plot ratio and the permissible floor area as a result of the amendments.

41. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD answered that the amendments did not result in any changes to the plot ratio. Although BHRs were relaxed, the permissible floor area remained unchanged.

42. A Member pointed out that the amendments to the OZP were first proposed about a decade ago. In view of the fact that many buildings in the district had already reached the age of 50 years, and compulsory sale could be initiated, the Member was concerned that the amendments to the OZP might accelerate acquisitions and redevelopments, and hence lead to drastic changes in the district.

43. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD replied that the redevelopment of buildings was decided by the market, and it was difficult to judge at this stage that whether the relaxation of BHRs would speed up redevelopment in the district. He emphasised that the relaxation of BHRs would not result in any changes in the permissible floor area.

44. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. She was also concerned that the amendments to the OZP would accelerate acquisitions and redevelopments in Wan Chai.
- ii. According to the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines, if the continuous projected façade length of a building exceeded 60 metres, a building gap of 15 metres should be provided. She asked that why the NBA next to the old Wan Chai Police Station was also included in the amendments.
- iii. She commented that it was a good practice for the department concerned to provide photomontage, and she asked whether pictures showing the sky viewed from the street could be provided as well. She pointed out that there were very few open spaces in Wan Chai. The more high-rise buildings were built, the smaller the sky could be seen. As a result, the environment of the district would be significantly affected.

45. A Member hoped that the Government could conduct more visionary planning. If the amendments to the OZP were expected to bring significant impact to the property market, measures should be formulated in advance to address the possible impact.

46. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. She pointed out that BHR for commercial zones was revised from 110 metres above Principal Datum (mPd) to 135 mPd, which would allow developers to construct an additional of about 8.5 storeys. She was concerned that the amendments would aggravate the wall effect of buildings and affect the air ventilation in Wan Chai.
- ii. She pointed out that the traffic in the district was very congested, and the commissioning of CWB would add to the burden of Wan Chai's transport network in the future. She was of the view that the amendments would accelerate developments in the district. She asked the department concerned whether a traffic impact assessment had been conducted with respect to the amendments to the OZP, so as to ensure the traffic condition would not be worsened; otherwise she would not support the amendments.

47. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. She pointed out that the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated was designated for "other specified uses". She asked whether the department concerned had planned to put the site on sale. She also enquired about the future uses of the vacant site behind the old Wan Chai Police Station, and whether the department concerned had considered using the site for residential developments.
- ii. She asked that how many buildings were aged above 30 years and with less than seven storeys in Wan Chai.
- iii. The Government had been promoting the concept of pleasant walking experience. However, there were a large number of aged buildings in Wan Chai, and walkways were very narrow. She was worried that the amendments would further shrink the open spaces in the district, making the provision of pleasant walking experience even more difficult.
- iv. Take the planning application in respect of the site next to 28 Hennessy Road from Swire Properties to the Town Planning Board (TPB) recently as an example. Although building gaps were to be provided in the new building, the planning involved privatisation of streets, which would destroy the characteristics of the community. She was worried that similar situation would be resulted from future developments.

48. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

Action

- i. Although additional storeys could be constructed after the relaxation of BHRs, the permissible floor area would remain unchanged. If the height of a building was increased, the area of each floor would have to be reduced accordingly.
- ii. According to the SBD Guidelines, newly constructed buildings were required to set back with a view to enhancing the environmental quality at pedestrian level and achieving better air ventilation in the district. Although BHRs were relaxed, the environment at pedestrian level would improve, thus TPB considered that such arrangements were appropriate.
- iii. In considering relaxing BHRs, PlanD had conducted an air ventilation assessment, which showed that the relaxation of BHRs would be unlikely to generate adverse impacts on ventilation in the district.
- iv. Regarding the traffic problem, TD would require the provision of additional parking spaces after the redevelopment. The Government would also seize the opportunity during the redevelopment process to address the traffic problem in the district. He stressed that the relaxation of BHRs would not aggravate the traffic problem in Wan Chai.
- v. The vacant site next to the old Wan Chai Police Station was a commercial site. According to the OZP, the site would be jointly developed with the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated, and the old Wan Chai Police Station would be conserved for hotel, commercial, community and cultural uses.

(Mr Ivan WONG and Co-opted Member Mr NG Hoi-shing joined the meeting at 3:30 p.m.)

49. The Chairperson raised the following comments:

- i. The amendments to the OZP were to relax BHRs on buildings located at the residential zones at Queen's Road East to the south, and Kennedy Road and Monmouth Terrace. Since most of the buildings there did not fully utilise the permissible building height due to various factors such as building design and construction cost, the actual growth in building height would be more than that as stated in the amendments.
- ii. She commented that information about the actual height of the existing buildings in the district should be obtained when considering the amendments to the OZP, since such information

could reflect the actual implications of the relaxation of the BHRs.

- iii. She pointed out that the BHR on the residential zone at Wan Chai Road was raised from 19 mPd to 110 mPd. Such a significant increase would impose heavy burden on the traffic in the district. She commented that traffic congestion was very severe in Wan Chai, thus the department concerned should propose additional ancillary transport measures to improve the traffic condition.
- iv. She hoped that the department concerned could prepare more detailed information about the amendments to the OZP, so that Members could conduct in-depth discussions.

50. Dr CHEUNG Charlton raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. He was concerned about the joint development of the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site. He pointed out that the old Wan Chai Police Station was a historical building, and asked that whether its ownership would be changed due to the joint development.
- ii. Mr Louis KAU mentioned several times in his replies that the gross floor area and the plot ratio would remain unchanged, but the annexes of many OZPs stated that the plot ratio could be relaxed as appropriate depending on the actual situation. He asked the department concerned that whether the amendments to the OZP in question could include a clause stipulating that the plot ratio could not be altered in the future.
- iii. He pointed out that the relaxation of the BHRs as stated in Item F and Item G would lead to the deletion of the requirement on the provision of the existing ventilation corridor along the coastline from Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building and Hennessy Road Government Primary School to Johnston Road, affecting ventilation at Johnston Road. Although under the SBD Guidelines, building gaps should be provided for newly constructed buildings, it was unknown that when the buildings in the district would be redeveloped. He enquired of the department concerned whether the amendments as stated in Items F and G could come into force at a later stage.

51. A Member stated that lands development in Hong Kong was mainly affected by two factors, i.e. plot ratio and BHR. If the plot ratio was unchanged, a building could either be taller in height with smaller area on each floor or shorter in height with bigger space on each floor. Regardless of the design, the gross floor area would stay unchanged.

52. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. She commented that although the plot ratio was unchanged, the design of buildings could vary, and this would affect the sky viewed from the ground. She hoped that the department concerned could provide photomontage to enable Members to have a better understanding of the visual impacts brought about by the amendments to the OZP.
- ii. She asked that how the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site would be jointly developed, and whether the Government had planned to put the old Wan Chai Police Station on sale. She pointed out that the old Wan Chai Police Station was a Grade 2 historic building, therefore she would like to know its future development plan.

53. A Member said that if buildings near the old Wan Chai Police Station had reached the age of 50 years, they might be acquired by developers and redeveloped together with the old Wan Chai Police Station. The Member considered that the department concerned should estimate the impacts caused by the amendments on the surrounding area.

54. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. She asked that if the building height above the principal datum remained unchanged, whether it was feasible to build a car park at the basement.
- ii. The department concerned did not explain what ancillary transport facilities would be provided in Wan Chai in response to the amendments to the OZP. She pointed out that many residential buildings included in the OZP did not have a car park. If these residential buildings were acquired by developers for redevelopment and new car parks were built, there would be an increase in vehicular flow. She also enquired of TD about the traffic impact caused by the amendments.
- iii. She pointed out that buildings taller in height had higher market values. She reckoned that the relaxation of the BHRs would stimulate redevelopment of the area.
- iv. She mentioned that the traffic problems caused by Times Square had been affecting the residents of the district. She asked that how the department concerned would address the traffic issues brought about by the amendments to the OZP.

(The Hon Paul TSE left the meeting at 3:45 p.m.)

55. The Chairperson stated that the majority of buildings near Blue House were old tenement buildings which were shorter in height. However, with the amendments to OZP, the BHR for the surrounding environment was relaxed to 110 mPd, meaning that buildings with about 30 storeys could be built around Blue House. She reckoned that the amendments would adversely affect the conservation of historic buildings and traffic in Wan Chai.

56. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

- i. When reviewing the BHRs, PlanD needed to calculate the required building height to allow buildings to maintain the current permitted plot ratio as well as complying with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance and the SBD Guidelines.
- ii. According to the calculation, the BHRs for commercial sites and residential sites were prescribed at 135 mPd and 110 mPd respectively. For certain buildings included in the amendments, their BHRs would be set at higher levels taking into account the site level.
- iii. Although certain buildings in the district had not fully utilised the permissible plot ratio, PlanD had to make reference to the current permitted plot ratio and provide sufficient space for future developments when reviewing the BHRs. Thus the calculation of BHRs should not be based on the current building height.
- iv. Regarding the visual impact brought about by the planning, PlanD had conducted a visual impact assessment in accordance with TPB Guidelines No. 41. According to the photomontage of the assessment, the relaxation of the BHRs would not affect the existing ridgelines.
- v. According to the planning direction of the OZP, the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site would be developed jointly, and such planning direction was not one of the amended items. He stated that the joint development aimed to achieve synergy effect, and the old Wan Chai Police Station would be conserved for hotel, commercial, community and cultural uses.
- vi. Items F1 and F2 which aimed to delete the NBA requirements were made based on the results of the air ventilation assessment, as well as the SBD Guidelines. According to the air ventilation assessment, an effective breezeway should be at least 15 metres in width, yet the widths of the passageways on both sides of the site were less than six metres. The adoption of the requirements of the

SBD Guidelines could enhance the environmental quality at pedestrian level and achieve better air ventilation in the district. Therefore the deletion of the NBA requirements would only slightly affect the ventilation. Besides, since the old Wan Chai Police Station was a historical building which needed to be conserved, the above amendments would not allow the construction of any new buildings on its both sides.

- vii. Regarding whether the amendments could include a clause stipulating that the plot ratio should not be altered, he said that except for certain sites, there was no restriction on plot ratio on the OZP, thus there was no provision stipulating that the plot ratio could be relaxed slightly. However, all developments should comply with the Buildings Ordinance.

57. Mr Ivan WONG asked PlanD that whether they had obtained an understanding of the public needs in considering the joint development of the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site. He reckoned that residents in the district might not need any more commercial facilities, instead, given the severe traffic problem, he suggested that the department concerned should consider using the site for the provision of a multi-storey public car park and community facilities. He hoped that the planning of the district could better satisfy the needs of the public.

58. Dr CHEUNG Charlton asked that whether the ownership of the old Wan Chai Police Station would be put on sale during the joint development. He was concerned that the plot ratio of the old Wan Chai Police Station would be transferred to the adjacent vacant site during the joint development, and he hoped that the ventilation corridor could be preserved.

59. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. Although TPB Guidelines No. 41 did not mention the coefficient of sky view, she was of the view that PlanD should consider the matter from the perspective of the residents, and include the coefficient of sky view in the visual impact assessment.
- ii. She shared the same concerns with Dr CHEUNG Charlton about the joint development of the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site.
- iii. She asked that whether the old Wan Chai Police Station was not included in the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme implemented by the Development Bureau, and why it had to be revitalised in the form of private ownership.
- iv. She commented that some non-government organisations might be

more capable of revitalising the old Wan Chai Police Station, and she hoped that a transparent mechanism could be established to handle the revitalisation work. She did not want to see the old Wan Chai Police Station become over-commercialised like 1881 Heritage in Tsim Sha Tsui, and reminded the Government not to repeat its mistake.

- v. She pointed out that Wan Chai might not need more hotels or commercial buildings, and she was of the view that the department concerned should take public needs into account when conducting the planning.

60. The Chairperson raised the following comments:

- i. She pointed out that the streets in the vicinity of Sun Street, Moon Street, Star Street and St. Francis Yard were very narrow, and the illegal parking problem was severe. If the BHR was relaxed to 110 mPd, the illegal parking issue in the area would become even more difficult to tackle.
- ii. At present, the mountain and a historical catch-water could still be seen if looking up towards the south side from Queen's Road East and Ship Street. However, if the entire Queen's Road East was erected with high-rise buildings, there would no longer be any mountain view.
- iii. She hoped that the department concerned could understand the needs of the public. She commented that the redevelopment of the cluster of the tenement buildings in the district into high-rise buildings would not only affect the landscape, but also seriously obstruct the air flow.

61. Mr Mark TANG of TD replied that since the plot ratio of the sites in the district would not be altered, the traffic impact would remain unchanged.

62. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG asked the Secretary to put the reply of TD on record, which stated that the traffic impact would remain unchanged since there was no change in the plot ratio. She considered such reply unacceptable. She pointed out that residents living in the district had been plagued by severe traffic congestion problem, and such problem was closely related to the transportation planning by TD. She opined that the traffic issue could not be resolved solely by strengthening law enforcement. She said that TD should tell the Council honestly if they did not have the statistics of the traffic impact assessment, and their reply was unprofessional.

63. Mr Ivan WONG hoped that the department concerned could answer directly that whether they had considered providing public facilities such as a

Action

multi-storey car park, charging facilities for electric vehicles and a rest garden in the district. The provision of a multi-storey car park in the district could significantly reduce the number of vehicles parked at roadside, and thus resolve the traffic congestion problem. He was of the view that financial returns should not be the top priority of the development planning of a district.

64. Miss Clarisse YEUNG supplemented that as mentioned by the Chairperson, many buildings did not fully utilise the permissible plot ratio. However, if the floor area of buildings were increased during the redevelopment in the future, the pedestrian and traffic flows would bound to be affected. Therefore, she reckoned that the reply of TD was unsubstantiated.

65. The Vice-Chairperson agreed with the comments raised by the above Members. He commented that the reply given by TD was evasive and unacceptable.

66. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments:

- i. She agreed with the comments raised by the above Members. She commented that the department concerned should not submit the amendments to the Council hastily simply because the old Wan Chai Police Station needed to be jointly redeveloped.
- ii. From her participation in the implementation of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme, she understood that under the current mode of operation, it was very challenging to conserve a historical building while achieving a balanced account, as well as attracting visitors. Nevertheless, joint development should not be the only option available for consideration. She was worried that the joint development might eventually destroy the elements which were originally targeted to be preserved.
- iii. It could not be seen from the paper that the department concerned had considered the characteristics of the district and taken public needs into account when conducting the planning. She hoped that the department concerned could carry out more researches and prepare a more detailed paper when submitting the amendments to the OZP to the Council in the future.

67. Dr CHEUNG Charlton supplemented that a number of government sites were situated at the southern end of the "Commercial (4)" zone near the old Wan Chai Police Station, including Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building and Hennessy Road Government Primary School. If the "Commercial (4)" zone would not be put on sale, and the neighbouring government sites could be maintained, the wall effect of the entire area could be minimised even if high-rise buildings were erected in the surrounding area in the future. Therefore, he hoped that the department concerned could consider retaining the

“Commercial (4)” zone for the provision of public facilities.

68. Mr Joey LEE said that he agreed with most of the opinions raised by Members. He commented that PlanD had neither conducted long-term planning for the future development of the district nor considered the needs of the residents. He considered that the reply of TD was unacceptable, and pointed out that the district had been plagued by severe traffic problem, and TD should not shift the responsibilities to law enforcement departments.

69. A Member pointed out that the provision of building gaps was not a new requirement introduced in recent years, and asked that whether it was a new approach to relax BHRs due to the provision of building gaps. The Member continued that the local situation and characteristics of each district were different, if BHRs were relaxed across the board, the daily lives of residents would be affected inevitably. The Member hoped that the department concerned could conduct more researches on the local situation before making amendments to the planning in the future.

70. Mr Ivan WONG asked PlanD and TD that whether they had considered utilising the sites in the vicinity of the old Wan Chan Police Station for the provision of a multi-storey public car park, as well as removing the parking spaces at roadside.

71. Miss Clarisse YEUNG stated that according to a recent news report, the Government had planned to put the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated together with the adjacent vacant site for sale for hotel development a few years ago. She asked the Government that whether the site would be used for constructing a hotel, and whether a transfer of plot ratio would be allowed during the joint development as mentioned by Dr CHEUNG Charlton. She commented that the construction of a hotel at the site would lead to severe traffic problems.

(Co-opted Member Ms CHING Lei-yuen joined the meeting at 4:20 p.m.)

72. Mr Mark TANG of TD clarified that TD would conduct a traffic impact assessment for any development projects. In addition, they would study each case and evaluate the required number of parking spaces based on the gross building area of the development, and the results differed from case to case. Regarding a Member's suggestion about building a public car park, he stated that no relevant information was received from PlanD.

73. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

- i. He stated that the purpose of attending this meeting was to explain the amendments to the OZP, including the deletion of the NBA requirements on both sides of the “Other Specified Uses” and

“Commercial (4)” zones near the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated. As for the uses of the two sites, the Administration had explained to the Council in 2010 that the two sites would be developed jointly, yet he understood that Members would like to express their latest opinions to the Administration.

- ii. According to his knowledge, TD had been implementing short, medium and long-term measures to solve the shortage of parking spaces in the district.
- iii. Although the site where the old Wan Chai Police Station was situated and the adjacent vacant site would be developed jointly, no transfer of plot ratio would be allowed. According to the OZP, the plot ratio of the vacant site was 12, which was lower than the average plot ratio of 15 for normal urban sites. He explained that a lower plot ratio was stipulated during the planning process since they had considered the traffic impact to be brought about by the development. Moreover, as the old Wan Chai Police Station was a historical building, they did not want to see high-rise buildings be developed in the surrounding area. He explained that the BHR was relaxed from 80 mPd to 110 mPd mainly because of the Court’s rulings.
- iv. Regarding the suggestion about constructing a public car park, the Administration had not studied the relevant proposals. Nevertheless, TD could consider requesting the provision of public parking spaces at the site during the land sale in the future.

74. Mr Ivan WONG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- i. Although the Council discussed the future development of the two sites in 2010, such discussion was conducted eight years ago, and the local situation had already undergone drastic changes since then.
- ii. He enquired about the short, medium and long-term measures implemented by TD to resolve the shortage of parking spaces in the district.
- iii. He pointed out that the study to be conducted by TD on the need for parking spaces during the sale of land was for addressing the needs arising from the redevelopment. However, his suggestion about utilising the site for the provision of a multi-storey car park and public facilities was made to address the traffic problem caused by the shortage of parking spaces in the district in the long run.

75. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

Action

- i. She enquired about the reasons for the collective sale of the two sites, if the joint development would not involve the transfer of plot ratio.
- ii. She pointed out that it had been eight years since the Council's discussion in 2010. She asked that why the department concerned could not conduct planning for the two sites based on the current situation of the district.
- iii. She commented that the redevelopment of the old Wan Chai Police Station into a hotel and the privatisation of the site had not taken the environmental needs of the district into consideration. She was of the view that the department concerned should not force through the project.

76. The Chairperson stated that the Chief Executive had mentioned in the Police Address that the Government was committed to developing Hong Kong into a walkable city, thus she reckoned that PlanD should attach greater importance to the needs of the local residents, and formulate measures to enhance the accessibility of Wan Chai. Furthermore, she noticed there was a mismatch between the demand and supply of transportation facilities in the district. She hoped that various departments could strengthen coordination when formulating policies, with a view to enhancing the quality of life of the residents.

77. The Chairperson asked Members to vote on the amendments to the OZP by a show of hands. A total of 13 Members present including the Chairperson Ms Kenny LEE, Vice-Chairperson Mr Anson LAM, Dr Jennifer CHOW, Ms Yolanda NG, Mr Joey LEE, Ms Peggy LEE, Mr Ivan WONG, Miss Clarisse YEUNG, Ms Jacqueline CHUNG, Dr CHEUNG Charlton, Co-opted Members Ms CHING Lei-yuen, Mr NG Kwok-shing and Mr NG Hoi-shing voted against the amendments, while Mr Stephen NG and Mr CHENG Ki-kin abstained from voting.

78. Mr Joey LEE stated that since the majority of Members objected to the amendments to the OZP, he suggested that a letter should be sent to TPB in the name of the Committee to express their views.

79. The Chairperson agreed to send a letter to TPB in the name of the Committee providing the names of Members who voted against the amendments. Members raised no objection to the above arrangement.

(Co-opted Member Ms LAU Pui-shan left the meeting at 4:25 p.m.)

(Post-meeting Note: The Committee sent a letter to TPB on 12 June to express its objection to the amendments to the OZP.)

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/28**

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H5/28-)	Gist of Representation	Responses
R1 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the OZP as it can increase the gross floor area (GFA) in development and address land supply shortage problem <p align="center"><u>Representer's Proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil 	Noted
R2 (Lee Theatre Realty Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support revision of building height restriction (BHR) of "C" zones under Amendment Item ("Item") A. The representers submit their own schemes for alternative BHRs at the sites of Lee Theatre Plaza (R2) and Leighton Centre (R3) which can allow quality building to be built 	Noted
R3 (Leighton Property Company Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grounds of representations can be summarised below: (a) <u>The Approach in Reviewing the BHR</u> 	<p align="center"><u>The Approach in Reviewing the BHR</u></p> <p>(i) The key objective of BH control is to provide better planning control in guiding developments to avoid excessive tall and out-of-context development which would adversely affect the quality of the living environment including air ventilation. In the light of the Court's ruling on the judicial reviews in relation to the OZP, a review of the BH and development restrictions on the OZP was conducted. The amendments incorporated into the current draft OZP have duly taken into account all relevant planning</p>

	<p>question are proportionate to the burden on that particular land owner</p> <p>(ii) The Lee Theatre Plaza and Leighton Centre fall within the 'triangle node' between Times Square and Lee Garden One. The triangle node includes three landmark buildings namely Times Square, Lee Garden One and Hysan Place with a building height (BH) of around 200mPD. There is no indication that the same conceptual approach is adopted for the representation sites when formulating the BHR</p> <p>(iii) General building plan for a building with 200mPD at the site of Leighton Centre was approved before the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) came into effect. The representer indicates that BHRs for some sites in Tsim Sha Tsui are based on approved building plans (i.e. Harbour City and New World Centre) and queries the different approach in the formulation of BHR on the Wan Chai OZP (R3 only)</p> <p>(b) <u>Assumptions in deriving BHR</u></p> <p>(i) The representatives query the assumptions used by the Planning Department (PlanD) on the sites of Lee Theatre Plaza and Leighton Centre for compliance with the BHR of 135mPD (including the low floor-to-floor height (FTFH), non-provision of sky garden, etc.)</p>	<p>considerations, the SBDG requirements, urban design guidelines, air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) undertaken in 2018 and permitted development intensity. The current BHRs for the representation sites are considered appropriate and have already allowed design flexibility for incorporation of SBDG requirements including greenery and/or design features on ground and at podium levels to improve both living and pedestrian environment</p> <p>(ii) As mentioned in Annex H2 of TPB Paper No. 10415, the Times Square together with the two other developments in the Causeway Bay Area, namely Lee Garden (208mPD) and Hysan Place (199mPD), have been recognised as landmark developments which form a key destination for shopping and entertainment in Causeway Bay. However, there is no intention to let the BH of individual sites within the 'triangle node' formed by the above-mentioned three landmark buildings to have a BHR of 200mPD since this would result in proliferation of high-rise development which is not in line with the planning control. Besides, a landmark building is not necessarily the tallest building in a neighbourhood</p> <p>(iii) Tsim Sha Tsui is a commercial high-rise node recognised in the Urban Design Guidelines and the recognition of committed developments under general building plans approvals is treated as an</p>
--	--	--

exception rather than a rule. It is therefore inappropriate to apply the approach adopted in Tsim Sha Tsui OZP to the subject OZP

(ii) The representers have provided their alternative schemes at Lee Theatre Plaza site and Leighton Centre site (**Drawing H-1** and **Drawing H-2** as extracted from the representations in **Annex VI**). The further relaxation of the BHR from 135mPD to 165mPD for Lee Theatre Plaza site and from 135mPD to 200mPD for Leighton Centre site allows a building design to accommodate a 5m floor-to-floor height to cope with modern requirements, incorporate green features and amenities such as sky gardens, podium gardens, reduction in podium bulk for better air ventilation, and incorporate drop-off area, landscaped plaza and incorporate run-in and run-out to improve pedestrian and vehicular traffic flows. The proposed 165mPD for the Lee Theatre Plaza site and 200mPD for the Leighton Centre site would not result in adverse visual impact as it is not visible in any vantage points produced by PlanD, particularly to the viewing point at Stubbs Road Lookout. There is no justification given in the OZP amendment that why 135mPD is more appropriate than the alternative BHRs at the sites of Lee Theatre Plaza (R2) for 165mPD and Leighton Centre (R3) for 200mPD

(c) Urban Design and Visual

No significant visual impact is perceived when viewing from the Stubbs Road Lookout Point thereby affecting

(iv) The existing BH and plot ratio (PR) of Lee Theatre Plaza are about 104mPD and 15 respectively, while that of Leighton Centre are 83.5mPD and 15 respectively. For Leighton Centre, there is also a set of building plans with a BH of 200mPD and a PR of about 15 which was first approved by the Building Authority on 24.4.2009. In determining the BHRs, a BHR of 135mPD is sufficient to accommodate the permissible development intensity for commercial development. Nevertheless, the building plans of Leighton Centre with approval by the Building Authority before imposition of BHRs in 2010 may proceed subject to the provision of the Buildings Ordinance

Assumptions in deriving BHR

(v) The assumptions adopted by PlanD were provided in Annexes D2 and D3 & E1 to E5 of TPB Paper No. 10415. According to the basic building profile, a BHR of 135mPD is able to accommodate the permissible GFA under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) for the Lee Theatre Plaza site and Leighton Centre site with 25% GFA concession (including the average 'disregarded GFA (e.g. mandatory features, plant rooms, etc. other than car parks)' for non-domestic buildings

	<p>any public interest if the BHR is revised to 135mPD, to 165mPD for the Lee Theatre Plaza site or to 200mPD for the Leighton Centre site</p> <p><u>Representers' Proposals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relax the BHR for the "C" zone covering the Lee Theatre Plaza from 135mPD to 165mPD or such alternative amendments that the Board sees fit with the representers' requirements (R2) • Relax the BHR for the "C" zone which covers Leighton Centre from 135mPD to 200mPD or such alternative amendments that the Board sees fit with the representers' requirements (R3) 	<p>of 15%; and the overall cap of 10% GFA concession for the total amount of green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential E&M/services as specified under APP-151. Since the BHR is able to allow all sites irrespective of the site class to accommodate the permissible GFA, some sites depending on the site class are able to adopt a higher FTFH (e.g. higher FTFH is possible for some typical floors for Class B and Class C sites depending on its site level and for the sites with the SBDG building setback (SB) but not building separation requirement). A refuge floor has been assumed in PlanD's notional scheme, but no basement is assumed for accommodating the permissible GFA under B(P)R in the assumptions adopted by PlanD</p> <p>(vi) The alternative schemes proposed by R2 and R3 have adopted different assumptions, which are entirely a design choice to be made by the project proponents, having taken into account all the relevant factors including the development restrictions on the OZP. The provision of sky garden is a green feature rather than a SBDG requirement and it is purely a choice to be made by the project proponent amongst various good practices to improve the building design. Under assumption adopted by PlanD, sky garden would be included in the 25% concessionary GFA and to be integrated into overall building design. Nevertheless, a 6m refuge floor cum sky garden</p>
--	---	---

could still be accommodated without rendering the BH of the notional schemes at the two representation sites exceeding the BHR of 135mPD.

Urban Design and Visual

(vii) Visual appraisal has been conducted as part of the BH review for the current OZP (Annex F2 of TPB Paper No. 10415), the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG have been adopted. These include compatibility of the BH profile with the surroundings and preserving the views to ridgelines/mountain backdrops and harbour from the strategic vantage points/important public viewing points. This is to achieve a balance between development rights and public interest. Different scenarios for those with high propensity for redevelopment (i.e. building aged 30 or above and BH of 15 storeys or below), having regarded to their site class or types of development, are assumed in the photomontage to illustrate possible visual impact of the revisions to the BHRs. In overall terms, the proposed BHRs will not result in unacceptable visual impact

Representers' Proposals

(viii) The BHR of 135mPD is considered sufficient to accommodate commercial developments at the

<p>R4 (Cherish Shine Limited)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support revision of BHR of the “C” zones under Item A as it allows greater flexibility for good and innovative design in commercial developments • Support revision of BHR for sub-area (b) of “C(6)” zone under Item C as the BHR is reasonable given the location settings • Oppose Item E1 as there is no apparent planning reason for not adopting BHR of 135mPD for the “R(A)” zone making it consistent with the BHR under Item C as well as the general rise of the BHs southward of Queen’s Road East (QRE). In addition, there should be a consistent BH profile for the residential area to the north of QRE which should be subject to BHR of 135mPD (Drawing H-3) • The grounds of representation can be summarised below: 	<p>Lee Theatre Plaza and Leighton Centre sites. The building design (including at the sites of the Lee Theatre Plaza and Leighton Centre) is solely a decision to be made by its project proponent having regard to all relevant considerations including the BHRs on the OZP. There is no justification for or technical assessments to substantiate further relaxation of the BHRs for the “C” zones covering Lee Theatre Plaza and Leighton Centre from 135mPD to 165mPD and 200mPD respectively</p>
		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

(a) Assumptions in deriving BHR

The estimated BH for the residential buildings is too restrictive and doubtful, therefore a statement of 'design approach and/or less desirable building design such as lower FTFH would need to be applied for future development' was made in the PlanD's assumption. The BHR is based on a low FTFH (3m), which the common FTFH for residential buildings should be 3.5m. There is no reason why BHRs could not be relaxed so that reasonable modern building design can be achieved. The BHR so imposed should be able to accommodate GFA concessions given under Buildings Ordinance, take into account interesting building design and adequate building design standard, reflect the BH of approved general building plans, and balance with potential impact on private property rights

(b) Urban Design and Visual

(i) There is no reason why stepped BH profile should not be applied in the western part of Wan Chai. It is reasonable to increase the BHR of the "R(A)" zone between the Items A and C to 135mPD. This would allow flexibility in design and variation in BH (as not all of the sites would be built up to the maximum permitted), and avoid a monotonous/uninteresting height profile for buildings on both sides of QRE which BHR of 110mPD is applied

Assumptions in deriving BHR

(i) Item E1 is related to revision of BHR for "R(A)" zones to the south of QRE, while Item C is related to revision of BHR for "C" zones. The BHR of 110mPD for "R(A)" zone was based on the basic building profile for a typical "R(A)" composite building to comply with SBDG (i.e. ranging from 90m to 93m for future redevelopment in this area which will be subject to the building setback but not building separation requirement) and the site levels of around 6mPD to 19mPD in the area. The assumptions demonstrate that there is scope to accommodate the permissible GFA and SBDG requirements under the BHR of 110mPD. Besides, the total number of storeys for Class A and Class B sites is less than the achievable number of storeys under BHR of 110mPD. Hence, a higher FTFH is possible for some typical floors under these sites. There is no strong reason to further relax the BHR of "R(A)" zone beyond the level as indicated in basic building profile of a typical composite building. In addition, the BHR of 110mPD for the "R(A)" sites to the south of Johnson Road and 135mPD for the "C" sites to the north of Johnston Road have already provided a height variation in general

(ii) The concern on FTFH raised by the representer is a design choice to be made by the project proponents, having taken into account all the

relevant factors including the development restrictions on the OZP.

Urban Design and Visual

(ii) Further relaxation of BHR would allow design flexibility to achieve modern building design and quality development. This would result in a more interesting skyline and not result in any adverse visual impact at the vantage points selected by PlanD

Representer's Proposal

- Apply a stepped BH in the western part of Wan Chai by relaxing the BHR of "R(A)" zone between Items A and C from 110mPD to 135mPD (i.e. as delineated on **Drawing H-3** and **Plan H-6**)

(iii) As pointed out in the TPB Paper No. 10415 for the current OZP amendment, the stepped height profile ascending from the harbour and gradually arising towards landward side would not be achievable given the existing high-rise developments in Wan Chai North (Planning Area H25), and the northern part of the Area i.e. north of Johnston Road/Hennessy Road, as well as the presence of residential developments with relatively lower development intensity and BH in the inland area to the south of Johnston Road/Wan Chai Road

(iv) For the "R(A)" zone between Items A and C, taking into account the estimated BH requirement of 90m to 96m for typical "R(A)" composite buildings which will be subject to the building setback and building separation requirements, and the existing site levels of about 4mPD to 7mPD, a BHR of 110mPD is considered appropriate

(v) As reasons given in (i) above on the assumption of the BHR for the Item E1 (i.e. "R(A)" zones to the south of QRE), there is no justification of further relaxing the BHR of Item E1 to create a stepped height profile

(vi) Visual appraisal has been conducted as part of the BH review for the current OZP (Annex F2 of TPB Paper No. 10415), the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG have been adopted. These include compatibility of the BH profile with the surroundings and preserving the views to ridgelines/mountain backdrops and harbour from the strategic vantage points/important public viewing point

Representer's Proposal

(vii) The BHR of 110mPD for "R(A)" zone is considered appropriate. There is no strong reason to further relax the BHR of "R(A)" zone beyond the level of basic building profile of a typical composite building. There is no justification for further relaxation of the BHR of Item E1 from 110mPD to 135mPD

(viii) As for the sites concerned under the representation which are not the subject of any amendment items under the current draft OZP. There is no ground for the Board to consider that part of the representer's proposal

<p>R5 (The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support revisions of BHRs of “C” zones under Item A and revision of BHR of “R(B)” zone covering the Monmouth Terrace under Item E3 • Support Items F1, F2, G1, G2 and G3 related to deletion of Non-building Area (NBA) and building gap (BG) requirements at various locations • Oppose Item B to revise BHR of “C(4)” zone to 110mPD and the amendment (a) to the Notes related to deletion of the NBA requirements of the “C(4)” zone • Oppose revision of the BHRs of “C(6)”, “OU(MU)”, “R(A)” and “R(A)5” zones under Items C, D, E1, E2 and E4 as the BHR relaxation is not sufficient • The grounds of representation can be summarised below: <p>(a) <u>The Approach in Reviewing the BHR</u></p> <p>The general height profile for Wan Chai should balance a number of considerations and take into account the adequate BHRs to accommodate GFA with concessions allowed, visual relief, interesting skyline and preserving the views from major recognized viewpoints</p> <p>(b) <u>Assumptions in deriving BHR</u></p> <p>(i) The BHRs are too restrictive to take into account the SBDG for some sites. Design Approach and/or less desirable building design such as lower FTFH would</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p><u>The Approach in Reviewing the BHR</u></p> <p>(i) The key objective of BH control is to provide better planning control in guiding developments to avoid excessive tall and out-of-context development which would adversely affect the quality of the living environment including air ventilation. In the light of the Court’s ruling on the JRs in relation to the OZP, a review of the BH and development restrictions on the OZP was conducted. The amendments incorporated into the current draft OZP has duly taken into account all relevant planning considerations, the SBDG</p>
---	---	---

	<p>need to be applied for future development. There is no reason why BHRs could not be relaxed so that reasonable modern building design can be achieved. The BHR so imposed should be able to accommodate GFA concessions given under Buildings Ordinance, take into account interesting building design and adequate building design standard, reflect the BH of approved general building plans, and balance with potential impact on private property rights</p> <p>(ii) FTFH nowadays are 5m (podium), 4.5m (typical commercial floors) and 3.15m (typical residential floors). Development industry considers that 6m FTFH for the ground floor of top quality commercial developments is required. A mix of office, retail and service activities now is common in many commercial buildings and flexibility in design of future commercial building should be given. Besides, the approved BH of general building plans should be reflected on the OZP</p> <p>(c) <u>Urban Design and Visual</u></p> <p>(i) Wan Chai is a prime district with great potential for accommodating more Grade A commercial/office developments. The BHRs had not taken into account the prime location of Wan Chai which is well served by public transport. The BHR of 110mPD for the “C” zones bounded by Tonnochy Road/Hennessy Road/Percival Street/Gloucester Road is far below the standard in this area. The visual impact consideration</p>	<p>requirements, urban design guidelines, AVA by EE undertaken in 2018 and permitted development intensity. The current BHRs for the representation sites are considered appropriate and have already allowed design flexibility for incorporation of SBDG requirements including greenery and/or design features on ground and at podium levels to improve both living and pedestrian environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions in deriving BHR</u></p> <p>(ii) The assumptions adopted by PlanD were provided in Annexes D2 and D3 & E1 to E5 of TPB Paper No. 10415. According to the basic building profile, a BHR of 135mPD for commercial sites is able to accommodate the permissible GFA under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) with 25% GFA concession (including the average ‘disregarded GFA (e.g. mandatory features, plant rooms, etc. other than car parks)’ for non-domestic buildings of 15%; and the overall cap of 10% GFA concession for the total amount of green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential E&M/services as specified under APP-151. Since the BHR is able to allow all sites irrespective of the site class to accommodate the permissible GFA, some sites depending on the site class are able to adopt a higher FTFH (e.g. higher FTFH is possible for some typical floors for Class B and Class C sites and for the sites with the SBDG</p>
--	--	---

<p>for keeping the BHR of 110mPD for these “C” zones is not well substantiated. No significant visual impact when viewing from the Stubbs Road Lookout Point thereby affecting any public interest if the BHR is revised to 135mPD</p> <p>(ii) The photomontages produced by the PlanD without consideration of building efficiency and ignored the fact that many redevelopments would not be built to the maximum height in situation of more relaxed BHRs</p>	<p>building setback but not building separation requirement). Different assumptions including FTFH are entirely a design choice to be made by the project proponent, having taken into account all the relevant factors including the development restrictions on the OZP. The building plans of developments with approval by the Building Authority before the imposition of BHRs in 2010 may proceed subject to the provision of the Buildings Ordinance.</p>
<p>(d) <u>Open Space to facilitate Air Ventilation</u></p> <p>Wan Chai is a dense urban area with severe open space deficit. The Government should look for more land to develop open space in order to facilitate air ventilation. Rezoning the Ex-WCPMQ site (“C(4)” site) to “Open Space” (“O”) is an effective way</p>	<p>(iii) Unlike other “C” zones in Wan Chai, which are subject to a maximum PR of 15 under the Buildings Ordinance, the “C(4)” site is subject to a maximum PR of 12 on the OZP. Hence, a BHR of 110mPD instead of 135mPD is able to accommodate the maximum PR of 12 in accordance with the basic building profile for a typical commercial building to comply with SBDG at this location with a site level of about 4mPD</p>
<p>(e) <u>Minor Relaxation should not be used to justify the low BHRs</u></p> <p>Reasonable BHRs should be set and minor relaxation should not be used to justify the low BHRs imposed on the OZP. If the Board is to rely on minor relaxation clause as a basis for setting unreasonably low BHRs then it could be considered to be acting unlawfully which was against the CFA’s judgement in relation to the Hysan case</p>	<p>(iv) For the “OU(MU)” zones to the south of Hennessy Road, taking into account the estimated BH requirement of a typical commercial development of about 118 to 130m with the incorporation of SBDG requirements, and the existing site levels of about 8mPD, a BHR of 135mPD is considered appropriate. The BHR of 135mPD of the “OU(MU)” zones is also sufficient to accommodate a typical “R(A)” type residential development taking into account the estimated BH</p>

(f) Setback Requirements

The OZP amendment ignored the representation R34 (to the previous version of the OZP No. S/H5/26) opposing the imposition of setback (SB) requirement. The SB requirements result in taking away private land without compensation. The SB requirement is imposed for air paths, rather than for road widening which can be covered by other relevant Ordinances such as Buildings Ordinance and the Roads (Works Use and Compensation) Ordinance. No provision under the Notes or the Explanatory Statement on the OZP indicating that the private land taken away for SB may be considered for bonus GFA in accordance with the normal practice

(g) Retention of "Commercial/Residential" ("C/R") Zone

The OZP amendment also ignored the representation R34 (to the previous version of the OZP No. S/H5/26) proposing retention of "C/R" zone or wider application of the "OU(MU)" zone. R34 was of the view that the "C/R" zone should be re-instated. Otherwise, the flexibility of the "OU(MU)" zone should be demonstrated for extensive use e.g. the "R(A)" area along the western side of Morrison Hill Road and southern side of Wan Chai Road and the area between Stewart Road and Percival Street may be zoned "OU(MU)". Moreover, relaxation or incentive scheme should be adopted to the "C" and "OU(MU)" zones, similar to that adopted by the Board for the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP, to encourage amalgamation of small sites for

requirement of about 90m to 96m with the incorporation of SBDG requirements

(v) For the residential zones to the south of Johnston Road and Wan Chai Road as well as residential sites on both sides of QRE, taking into account the estimated BH requirement of 90m to 96m for typical "R(A)" composite buildings which will be subject to the building setback and building separation requirements, and the existing site levels of about 4mPD to 7mPD, a BHR of 110mPD is considered appropriate. For the "R(A)" zone in KR, taking into account the existing level of the site is about 51.5mPD and to accommodate a typical composite building, a BHR of 140mPD is considered appropriate. It should also be noted that for the "R(B)" in KR (as delineated on **Plan H-6**) is subject to a BHR of 120mPD, which is not the subject of the current OZP amendment. Hence, the Board has no ground to consider the proposal of relaxing the BHR of this "R(B)" zone from 120mPD to 150mPD taking into account the maximum site level of about 37mPD and an estimated BH requirement of 86m to cater for a pure residential development with permissible GFA under B(P)R, a BHR of 120mPD is considered appropriate

Urban Design and Visual

(vi) Visual appraisal has been conducted as part of the

<p>development/redevelopment of quality and well designed commercial/office buildings</p> <p>(h) <u>Procedural Matters</u></p> <p>(i) Not all the issues raised in representation (R34) had been considered and REDA had not been invited to participate of the Board's consideration in OZP amendment. There was no formal rehearing of R34 as required in the Court's Orders. The Board inviting representations on the new draft OZP from the general public including the original representatives, is not a satisfactory or compliant way to discharge the Court's specific Order. The OZP amendment does not cover all of the matters to which objection was made in the original representation R34 which must be reheard under the Court's Orders. If the Board takes the views that only those issues which have been accepted for the OZP amendment, REDA is of the view that the direction of the CFI have not been complied with</p> <p>(ii) Having regard to the above, REDA are prepared to take a pragmatic approach and had submitted representation related to both OZP No. S/H5/28 and include those representations in R34 to the amendment items under Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26. REDA requested the Board to accept the pragmatic approach and confirm that it will fully consider those amendments items which it objected to in R34 on OZP No. S/H5/26 which have not been fully addressed in the amendments included in OZP No. S/H5/28 as part of</p>	<p>BH review for the current OZP (Annex F2 of TPB Paper No. 10415), the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG have been adopted. These include compatibility of the BH profile with the surroundings and preserving the views to ridgelines/mountain backdrops and harbour from the strategic vantage points/important public viewing point. Different scenarios for those with high propensity for redevelopment (i.e. building aged 30 or above and BH of 15 storeys or below), having regarded to their site class or types of development, are assumed in the photomontage to illustrate possible visual impact of the revisions to the BHRs</p> <p>(vii) The "C" sites bounded by Tonnochy Road/Hennessy Road/Percival Street/Gloucester Road is subject to a BHR of 110mPD, which is not the subject of the current OZP amendment. The Board has no ground to consider the proposal of relaxing the BHR of these street blocks from 110mPD to 135mPD. Nevertheless, the BHR of 110mPD for these sites is to minimise the visual impact in particular on the view to harbour from Stubbs Road Lookout Point. This is to achieve a balance between development rights and public interest. The visual impact of relaxing the subject street blocks to 135mPD is illustrated in Plan H-12</p>
---	--

	<p>the section 7 representation process. It also requested the Board to consider any amendments to OZP No. S/H5/28 in relation to such items and gazette those amendments under section 6B(8) or section 7 of the Ordinance</p> <p><u>Representer's Proposals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relax the BHR for the area to the north of Hennessy Road (i.e. as delineated on Plan H-4) from 110mPD to 135mPD and the BHR for the area zoned "C", sub-area (b) of "C(6)" (i.e. Item C) and "OU(MU)" zones to the south of Hennessy Road (i.e. Item D) from 135mPD to 150mPD Relax the BHR for the residential zones to the south of Johnston Road and Wan Chai Road as well as residential sites on both sides of QRE (i.e. as delineated on Plan H-6) from 110mPD to 130mPD and the BHR for the residential zones adjacent to the western part of Kennedy Road (i.e. including the "R(A)" zone under Item E2 and the "R(B)" zone as delineated on Plan H-6) from 120mPD and 140mPD to 150mPD Rezone "C(4)" to "O" zone 	<p><u>Open Space to facilitate Air Ventilation</u></p> <p>(viii) The current amendments to the OZP only involve revision to the BHR and deletion of NBA on the two sides of the "C(4)" zone. There is no change to the land use zoning of the site (i.e. "C(4)"), which is not the subject of amendment. According to the updated AVA conducted in 2018, the two NBAs at the "C(4)" site are narrow and partially blocked and may not be able to serve as district air paths. The building design measures under the SBDG could serve similar air ventilation purpose for the locality. As for the R5's proposal of rezoning the "C(4)" site to "O", it should be noted that the overall provision of the open space in the Wan Chai District will be adequate to meet the requirement of the planned population in the area. Hence, there is no planning justification to convert unused government site into public open space. Similar proposal was also raised in the opposing views of the representation (R34) on the amendment items to the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26. PlanD's responses were at Annex HI of TPB Paper No. 10415</p> <p><u>Minor Relaxation should not be used to justify the low BHRs</u></p> <p>(ix) The current BHRs have already allowed design flexibility for incorporation of SBDG requirements including greenery and/or design features on</p>
--	--	---

ground and at podium levels to improve both living and pedestrian environment without relying on minor relaxation of BHR

Setback Requirements

(x) An updated AVA (EE) has been undertaken in 2018 to review the NBA, BG and SB requirements. The SB requirements for narrow streets perpendiculars to QRE are recommended to be maintained to facilitate air ventilation

(xi) The provision of SB requirements on the OZP would not take away the private land from development. The concerned area can still be included in the site area for PR/GFA calculation purpose. With regard to the provision of bonus GFA for such SB requirement in the Notes of the OZP, it is not necessary since there is no PR restriction for the "R(A)" zone on the OZP. Development/redevelopment within these zones will be subject to the permissible PR under the Building (Planning) Regulations and any claim for bonus PR could be processed following the established mechanism under the Buildings Ordinance. Similar issue had been raised in the opposing views of the representation (R34) on the amendment items to the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26 and PlanD's responses were at Annex HI of TPB Paper No. 10415

Retention of "Commercial/Residential" ("C/R") Zone

(xii) The current amendments to the OZP only involve revision to the BHR of the "OU(MU)" zone (i.e. from 110mPD to 135mPD). There is no change to the land use zoning of the concerned sites (i.e. "OU(MU)" zone), which is therefore not the subject of amendment. The previous "C/R" zones were reviewed for more effective infrastructure planning and better land use management. For areas with no predominant land uses, they were recommended to be rezoned as "OU(MU)" zone as a transitional buffer between the commercial and residential areas. There is no change in the planning circumstance at this stage to review the subject "OU(MU)" zone. Similar issues had been raised in the opposing views of the representation (R34) on the amendment items to the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26 and PlanD's responses were at Annex HI of TPB Paper No. 10415

Procedural Matters

(xiii) In the light of the Court's ruling on the JRs in relation to the OZP, a review of the BH and development restrictions on the OZP was conducted. The amendments incorporated into the current draft OZP has duly taken into account all relevant planning considerations, the SBDG requirements, urban design guidelines, AVA by EE

and permitted development intensity. The opposing representations R34 and R97 on the amendment items to OZP No. S/H5/26 have been duly addressed and indicated in Annexes H1 and H2 of TPB Paper No. 10415 in the current round of OZP amendment. As soon as the TPB agreed that the proposed amendments to the OZP were suitable for exhibition under Town Planning Ordinance on 13.4.2018, the Government had issued a letter on 27.4.2018 informing REDA about the Board's decision and inviting REDA to submit representations and comments in respect of the proposed amendments upon gazette. During the statutory plan exhibition period, REDA had submitted a representation (R5) which has included those amendment items which they had objected to in R34 in respect of the OZP No. S/H5/26 but which they considered had not yet been addressed under the amendments incorporated in the current OZP (No. S/H5/28). Lee Theatre Realty Limited and Leighton Property Company Limited also submitted representations in respect of the current OZP (R2 and R3 respectively). They have revised the previous proposal made under R97 for relaxation of the BHR on the area covering the Lee Theatre site and the Leighton Centre site to 200mPD. While the proposal for the Leighton Centre site remains unchanged under R3, the BHR proposal for the Lee Theatre site is revised to 165mPD under R2

(xiv) All items raised by Lee Theatre Realty Limited, Leighton Property Company Limited and REDA have been included in this paper (TPB Paper No. 10512) for consideration by the Board, such that the Board can duly reconsider the previous R97 jointly submitted by Lee Theatre Realty Limited and Leighton Property Company Limited as well as REDA's previous R34 in respect of OZP No. S/H5/26 in the context of the current representations **R2**, **R3** and **R5**. Should the Board consider that any amendments to OZP No. S/H5/28 are necessary after consideration of the representations including **R2**, **R3** and **R5**, it will gazette those amendments under appropriate section of the Ordinance.

Representer's Proposals

(xv) The BHRs for "C", "C(4)", sub-area (b) of "C(6)", "OU(MU)", "R(A)" and "R(B)" zones are considered appropriate. There is no justification for or technical assessments to substantiate further relaxation of BHRs for these zones

(xvi) Given the overall provision of open space will be adequate in the district, there is no planning justification for converting unused government site into public open space

		(xvii) As for the sites concerned under the representation which are not the subject of any amendment items under the current draft OZP. There is no ground for the Board to consider that part of the representor's proposal
<p>R6 (Development, Planning and Transport Committee, Wan Chai District Council (WCDC))</p> <p>R7 (YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse, WCDC Member)</p> <p>R8 (Individual)</p> <p>R9 to R48 (Individuals)</p> <p>R49 (Individual)</p> <p>R50 (Green Sense)</p> <p>R52</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R6 to R48 oppose all Items • R49 opposes all Items except E1 • R50 opposes all Items except G1 to G3 • R52 opposes Item A • The grounds of representations can be summarised below: <p>(a) <u>Accelerating redevelopment and Driving property price</u></p> <p>(i) It will intensify urban sprawl and speed up acquisition and redevelopment of buildings, leading to gentrification in the district and causing a drastic increase in property price. It will only benefit the developers in profit making rather than for the benefit of the general public (R6, R7, R9 to R28, R31 to 45, R47, R48 and R50)</p> <p>(ii) Redevelopment of the old residential buildings in "OU(MU)" zone have displaced the sitting residents which would result in an imbalance development between commercial and residential developments and</p>	<p><u>Accelerating redevelopment and driving property price</u></p> <p>(i) The OZP amendment is mainly about reviewing the OZP of the development restrictions including BHRs and requirements of NBA, BG and SB. The revision of BHRs is mainly for allowing design flexibility for both commercial and residential developments incorporating SBDG requirements. There is primarily no PR/GFA restrictions under the "C" (except "C(1)", "C(2)" and "C(4)"), "R(A)" (and its subzones), "R(B)" and "OU(MU)" zones. Developments intensities within these zones are subject to the provision of Buildings Ordinance. Since there is no change to</p>

(Individual)	<p>give rise to conflict between different users (R7, R9, R11 to R27, R29 to R31 and R34 to R48, R50, R52)</p> <p>(b) <u>Traffic and Pedestrian</u></p> <p>Wan Chai is densely built with insufficient transport/traffic facilities, car parking spaces, roads and footpaths for vehicles and pedestrians. The existing intensity of developments in Wan Chai have not been fully utilized. Relaxation of BHR would encourage redevelopment and increase the development intensity (e.g. PR and floor area) in the already congested Wan Chai causing further increase in pedestrian and traffic flow and affect the environment and residents in the area (R6, R7, R8, R9 to R28, R31 to 45, R47, R48, R50)</p> <p>(c) <u>Visual, Air Ventilation and Living Environment</u></p> <p>(i) The relaxation of BHR would result in an increase in number of tall buildings which would lead to adverse impacts to visual and air ventilation (R6 and R7)</p> <p>(ii) The revision of BHR under the OZP only emphasised the impact on the ridgeline and mountain backdrop from selected viewing points. There is no consideration on the impact to sky view factor (i.e. looking up from street level) and tall building will block sunlight penetration thereby leading to shadowing effect and deterioration of living environment (R7, R10 to R19, R21 to R23, R25 to R29, R31, R32, R34, R35 R37 to R48, R50)</p>	<p>the allowable development intensity, the claim that relaxing the BHR will accelerate redevelopment and drive property price may not be justified. It should also be noted that under the "OU(MU)" zone, residential developments are also permitted. The type of buildings to be redeveloped within the "OU(MU)" zone would be market-led and is at the discretion of project proponents</p> <p><u>Traffic and Pedestrian</u></p> <p>(ii) As the revisions to the BHRs do not involve any increase in PR, the Transport Department (TD) considers that significant increase in traffic and pedestrian flow is not envisaged. Besides, parking standards and requirements including ancillary private car parking spaces would be considered in all development/ redevelopment projects by TD at the building plan submission stage. In any case, TD will continue to monitor the traffic and parking conditions in the area and review the need for any transport facilities, road improvement works and traffic management measures as appropriate. TD is also of the view that setback area at street level according to SBDG can be open up for use as footpath which can improve pedestrian circulation</p>
--------------	--	--

	<p>(iii) Views of the sky and mountain backdrops will be affected and the stepped BH concept that allows maximum views of the harbour and pleasure to both residents and staff working in commercial towers is being sacrificed. The wall effect would deprive many buildings behind of the harbour view enjoyment and well being of the entire community (R8)</p> <p>(iv) Deletion of NBAs on the two sides of the Ex-Wan Chai Police Station (WCPS) site and Ex-Wan Chai Police Married Quarters (WCPMQ) site would reduce public space, affect air ventilation and reduce sunlight penetration (R6, R7, R10 to R23, R25 to R27, R29 to R31, R33 to R35, R37 to R45, R47 and R50)</p> <p>(v) The major impediment to good ventilation is the prevalence of high podium (R8)</p> <p>(d) <u>Open Space Provision</u></p> <p>Increase in BH of commercial and residential sites would attract more residents and workers to the district. However the OZP does not incorporate provision of additional open space for a district that is highly deficient. Moreover, the long delayed district open space around the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre is too distant and difficult to get to and to qualify as anything more than a tourist attraction (R8)</p>	<p><u>Visual, Air Ventilation and Living Environment</u></p> <p>(iii) Relaxation of BHR would not lead to deterioration of air ventilation as reflected in AVA EE 2018. It is anticipated that the general wind environment of the area would be improved in the long run when the number of redeveloped buildings following SBDG increase. Since relying on SBDG alone would not be sufficient to ensure good air ventilation at district level, air ventilation measures at strategic locations on the OZP are necessary. The current OZP maintains the SB requirements for narrow streets perpendicular to QRE and the NBA at the junction of Oi Kwan Road and Tai Yan Street</p> <p>(iv) In respect of the representations against the deletion of NBA and BG, it should be noted that NBAs designated along the eastern and western boundaries of the Ex-WCPS site, Ex-WCPMQ site, the BGs imposed on the eastern and western boundaries of Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building site and the eastern boundary of Hennessy Road Government Primary School site as well as to the north of Ruttonjee Hospital are considered quite narrow and the wind entrance to these air paths has been partially blocked by the existing high-rise developments in the north (e.g. China Resources Building and Causeway Centre). According to the AVA EE 2018, these NBAs and</p>
--	--	--

	<p><u>(e) Public Interest in the OZP Amendment</u></p> <p>(i) The rezoning of the proposed amendments is contradictory to the rational of the amendments made in 2010 (e.g. prevent out-of-context developments and designation of NBA, SB and BG requirements to facilitate air ventilation. The OZP amendment is exclusively for the interest of the developers. PlanD took the advantage of the court ruling to increase the BH which are not the subject to any proceeding. The ruling concerned procedural issues and it is not mandatory to relax BHR to a certain limit (i.e. from 5 to 40%). The rights of the property owners are not absolute and the rights of the community must be respected. Moreover, it would not preclude developers from applying for additional BH through “minor relaxations” after relaxation of BHR (R8)</p> <p>(ii) There is no public interest to revise the BHRs and delete the NBA and BG requirements, in particular no public interest in the revision of BHR of “C(4)” zone unless the developer agrees to pay an additional land premium to the Government; no public interest to delete the NBAs/BGs which allow the public to walk through and for the protection of historical building of Ex-WCPS; and the provision of minor relaxation in BHR means the development in commercial zones subject to BHR of 135mPD can be built up to 140mPD (R49)</p>	<p>BGs may not be able to serve as district air paths in the district and there are alternative building design measures under SBDG (e.g. ventilated communal gardens) that could serve similar air ventilation purpose for the locality, these requirements are therefore deleted on the OZP</p> <p>(v) Visual appraisal has been conducted as part of the BH review for the current OZP (Annex F2 of TPB Paper No. 10415), the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG have been adopted. The vantage points selected are either views at a strategic level according to the Urban Design Guidelines or an important public viewing point to the public. Redevelopments incorporating SBDG requirements like building setback, building gap, greenery and promotion of podium-free design may provide certain visual relief at street level</p> <p>(vi) Regarding the concerns on the possible adverse environmental impact of the relaxation of BHRs, since the OZP amendments would not affect the development intensity, and the uses in the areas subject to the OZP amendments are not polluting in nature, the Director of Environmental Protection advises that adverse environmental impact including air and noise pollutions is not anticipated. Besides, the relaxation of BHRs would allow design flexibility and scope for development to adopt SBDG and/or design</p>
--	--	--

(f) Assumptions in deriving BHR

The assumptions used in working out the typical BH of commercial and composite building in Annexes D2 and D3 are doubtful. While HKPSG allows for site coverage of commercial buildings to exceed the stipulated standard of 60% for buildings over 61m it does not say that the 15m podium should occupy the entire footprint (R8)

(g) Revitalisation of the Ex-WCPS

There are concerns on the revitalization of the Ex-WCPS bundled with commercial development, which could otherwise be used to solve the existing problems of lack of open space and G/IC facilities. This will deprive the public's right in using public space and the effectiveness in heritage conservation is in doubt (R6, R7, R9, R11 to R27, R29, R30, R32 to R45, R47, R48, R50)

Representer's Proposal

- Nil

features that would improve the pedestrian environment and provision of greenery

(vii) The BHRs relaxation is to allow design flexibility for future developments in meeting SBDG which will improve the overall building permeability and visual amenity of the pedestrian environment. The proposed BHRs would be a matter of trade-off amongst different urban design considerations in the dense urban core like Wan Chai. It is anticipated that variation in lot size and development scale as well as differences in design styles and consideration would also contribute to varieties in BH and outlook over the area. In overall terms, the proposed BHRs relaxation will not result in unacceptable visual impact

(viii) Private views from residential or commercial towers are not considered with reference to the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 41 on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board as it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant consideration in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views from key strategic and important public viewing point

Open Space Provision

(ix) Since the proposed OZP amendments would not affect the development intensity permitted under the OZP, it would not attract more residents and workers to the district. The overall provision of the open space and G/C facilities in the Wan Chai District will be adequate to meet the requirement of the planned population in the area. Hence, there is no planning justification to convert unused government sites into public open space

Public Interest in the OZP Amendment

(x) Set against the background of high redevelopment pressure in the Wan Chai area and the tendency for project proponents to propose high-rise buildings to maximise views of the harbour, the main purpose in stipulation of BHRs on the Wan Chai OZP in 2010 is to provide better planning control in guiding developments/redevelopments to avoid excessively tall and out-of-context developments which will adversely affect the visual quality of the area. In the current BH review, due considerations have been given to the SBDG and other planning and design requirements. The revised BHRs incorporated in the current round of OZP amendment are considered to have balanced the public interest and private development right as well as the Court's ruling in respect of the JRs

Assumptions in deriving BHR

- (xi) The assumptions adopted by PlanD are based on the basic building profile for assessing the BH required for incorporation of SBDG requirements of different type of developments (i.e. for residential and commercial types of buildings). They are in line with the provisions of the B(P)R including the permissible SC

Revitalisation of the Ex-WCPS

- (xii) The OZP amendment is related to the deletion of NBA at the Ex-WCPS. There is no review of its zoning. The Ex-WCPS site was rezoned from "G/IC" to "OU" site in 2010 under the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26, which was also presented to WCDC for consultation. The hearing of the representations and comments in respect of the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26 was conducted by the Board on 26.4.2011. The planning intention of the subject "OU" site is primarily for preservation and adaptive re-use of the Ex-WCPS building for hotel, commercial, community and/or cultural uses as an integrated project with the Ex-WCPMQ across Jaffe Road. The EX-WCPS is a Grade 2 historical building and will not be demolished

<p>R51 (Individual)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Item A since the BHR of 210mPD for the commercial development of Hopewell Centre II at Kennedy Road is higher than the revised BHR of 135mPD • Opposes Item E1 since the proposed BH in the planning application for a commercial development at 155 – 167 QRE is 90mPD. The representer also suggests extending BHR under Item E1 to an area in Hill Side Terrace, Nam Koo Terrace and Miu Kang Terrace under application for rezoning <p><u>Representer’s Proposals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt BHR of 207mPD for the proposed Hopewell Centre II in Kennedy Road • Adopt BHR of 90mPD for 155 – 167 Queen’s Road East under Item E1 • Extend BHR of Item E1 (i.e. 110mPD) to the Hill Side Terrace, Nam Koo Terrace and Miu Kang Terrace 	<p>(i) The representation sites of R51 include the Hopewell Centre II (HCII) (zoned “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Redevelopment Area”); Hill Side Terrace, Nam Koo Terrace and Miu Kang Terrace (zoned “O”, “R(C)” and “G/C”; and 155 – 167 QRE (zoned “R(A)” under Item E1). The zoning and the BHR of the HCII as well as the zonings of the sites of Hill Side Terrace, Nam Koo Terrace and Miu Kang Terrace are not the subject of the current OZP amendments. It should be noted that this “OU” zone is already subject to a BHR of 210mPD on the OZP</p> <p>(ii) For the site at 155 – 167 QRE which is zoned “R(A)” and covered under Item E1. The BHR of 110mPD for ‘R(A)’ zone which was based on the basic building profile for a typical composite building to comply with SBDG and the site levels of around 6mPD-19mPD in the area is considered appropriate, there is no justification to restrict the site to a BHR of 90mPD</p> <p><u>Representer’s Proposals</u></p> <p>(iii) The BHR of 110mPD for “R(A)” zone is considered appropriate. There is no strong reason to further relax the BHR of “R(A)” zone beyond the level of basic building profile of a typical composite building. There is no justification to restrict the site to a BHR of 90mPD</p>
------------------------------------	--	---

		<p>(iv) As for the sites concerned under the representation which are not the subject of any amendment items under the current draft OZP. There is no ground for the Board to consider that part of the representor's proposal</p>
<p>R53 (Individual)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Item B mainly for reason that the BHR of the "C(4)" zone under Item B should be 135mPD in order to tally with the Items A, C and D <p><u>Representor's Proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a BHR of 135mPD for the whole Wan Chai area 	<p>(i) Unlike other "C" zones in Wan Chai, which are subject to a maximum PR of 15 under the Buildings Ordinance, the "C(4)" site is subject to a maximum PR of 12 on the OZP. Hence, a BHR of 110mPD instead of 135mPD is able to accommodate the maximum PR of 12 in accordance with the basic building profile for a typical commercial building to comply with SBDG at this location with a site level of about 4mPD</p> <p><u>Representor's Proposal</u></p> <p>(ii) The BHR of 110mPD for "R(A)" zone is considered appropriate. There is no strong reason to further relax the BHR of "R(A)" zone beyond the level of basic building profile of a typical composite building. There is no justification for further relaxation of the BHR to 135mPD</p> <p>(iii) The BHRs for "C", "C(4)", sub-area (b) of "C(6)", "OU(MU)", "R(A)" and "R(B)" zones are considered appropriate. There is no justification for or technical assessments to substantiate further</p>

		<p>relaxation of BHRs for these zones</p> <p>(iv) As for the sites concerned under the representation which are not the subject of any amendment items under the current draft OZP. There is no ground for the Board to consider that part of the representor's proposal</p>
<p>R54 to R75 (Individuals)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Item E1 • Oppose revision of BHR of the "R(A)" zones to the south of the QRE under Item E1 mainly for reasons of incompatibility of the proposed BH with the surroundings and nearby historical buildings; conservation of the existing buildings in the district; driving up land price; leading to decrease in flat size; crowded living condition and increase in temperature in the urban area; bringing adverse impacts on air ventilation, air quality, environment, traffic congestion, pedestrian environment, living environment, community, visual and sunlight penetration, and provision of open space and public utilities for the proposed amendment is required <p><u>Representor's Proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain BHR of 100mPD for areas covered by Item E1 (R54 to R57, R59 to R62, R68 to R71 and R75) 	<p>(i) The area to the south of the QRE is mainly occupied by a mixture of old and new, low to high-rise residential developments with commercial uses on the lower floors. High-density commercial developments including Wu Chung House, Hopewell Centre, Hopewell Centre II (under construction) could also be found in the central part of QRE. The area is zoned "R(A)" on the OZP which is intended primarily for high-density residential developments</p> <p>(ii) The BHR of 110mPD for 'R(A)' zone was based on the basic building profile for a typical "R(A)" composite building to comply with SBDG (i.e. ranging from 90m to 93m for future redevelopment in this area which will be subject to the building setback but not building separation requirement) and the site levels of around 6mPD to 19mPD in the area. There is no strong reason to further relax the BHR of "R(A)" zone beyond the level of basic building profile of a typical composite building</p>

(iii) With regard to concerns on driving up land price; leading to decrease in flat size; crowded living condition and increase in temperature in the urban area; bringing adverse impacts on air ventilation, air quality, environment, traffic congestion, pedestrian environment, living environment, community, visual and sunlight penetration, and provision of open space and public utilities for the proposed amendment, please refer to PlanD's responses under 'Accelerating redevelopment and driving property price', 'Traffic and Pedestrian', 'Visual , Air Ventilation and Living Environment' and 'Open Space Provision' of **R6, R7, R8, R9 to R48, R49, R50 and R52** above

(iv) The Government has his own heritage conservation policy for conservation of historic buildings. For example, the historical buildings known as 'Blue House' (Grade 1) and 'Yellow House' (Grade 2) in the area are covered by Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/King Sing Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/H5/URA2/2 and zoned "OU" annotated "Open Space and Historical Buildings Preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses" and are not the subject of current OZP amendment. Antiquities Advisory Board will consider the heritage value and grading of the existing buildings if necessary

Representer's Proposal

(v) The BHR of 110mPD for "R(A)" zone is considered appropriate. There is no strong reason to amend the BHR of "R(A)" zone beyond the level of basic building profile of a typical composite building to allow design flexibility for incorporation of SBDG requirements. There is no justification to maintain a BHR of 100mPD (**R54, R55, R56, R57, R59, R60, R61, R62, R68, R69, R70, R71 and R75**)

**Summary of Comments on Representations and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/28**

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H5/28-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
C1 (Individual) (Also as RI)	Support R1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the OZP because the amendments to the draft OZP have considered the overall impact as well as the developments in the district 	Noted
C2 and C3 (Individuals)	Support R2 and R3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Item A and suggest the BHR should be further relaxed for the Lee Theatre Plaza site (from 135mPD to 165mPD) and the Leighton Centre site (from 135mPD to 200mPD) so that high quality building can be developed (C3) 	Please refer to responses under R2 and R3 above
C4 and C5 (Individuals)	Support R4 and R5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the relaxation of BHR to 135mPD (C4 and C5) Oppose Item E1 and request further relaxation of the BHR from 110mPD to 135mPD for urban design reason (C4 and C5) Support R5's views on provision of more open space to facilitate air ventilation (C4) 	Please refer to responses under R4 and R5 above
C6 (Individual)	Oppose R49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reason for opposing relaxation of BHR under Items A to D, E1* and E3 are not justified since the relaxation of BHR is not accompanied with an increase in PR. Hence, there would be no increase in GFA and 	Please refer to responses under R49 above

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H5/28-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
C7 (YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse, WCDC Member) (Also as R7)	Agree with R1, R5 (part), R6 to R43, R49, R50 and R54 to R75 Oppose/Not agree with R2, R3, R4, R5 (part) and R53	hence no increase and impact on traffic (*EI was not opposed by R49 in its representation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the views of representations that the amendments would speed up acquisition and redevelopment of old buildings, causing gentrification in the district; and affect air ventilation and block sunlight penetration the amendments should balance community and economic development; the concern on preservation of the Ex-WCPS through privatization, and support R5's proposal to rezone the "C(4)" to "O" zone Oppose the views/justifications of representations requesting for further relaxation of BHR mainly for the reason that it will only benefit the developers in profit making rather than for the benefit of the general public 	Please refer to responses to R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 to R43, R49, R50, R53 and R54 to R75 above.
C8 (Owners' Committee of One Wan Chai)	Support R6 to R48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose all Items since the relaxation of BHR would make traffic condition worse and affect the living environment and street environment in the area 	Please refer to responses under 'Traffic and Pedestrian' of R6, R7, R8, R9 to R28, R31 to 45, R47, R48, R50 above.
C9 (Individual) (Also as R8)	Not Specified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Court's ruling was on the process and procedures. Property right should be subject to restriction 	Please refer to responses under 'Public Interest' of R8 above

**List of Representers in respect of
Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28**

申述人名單
灣仔分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H5/28

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/H5/28-1	Lau Chun Kit
TPB/R/S/H5/28-2	Lee Theatre Realty Limited
TPB/R/S/H5/28-3	Leighton Property Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H5/28-4	Cherish Shine Limited
TPB/R/S/H5/28-5	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-6	Development, Planning & Transport Committee, Wan Chai District Council (WCDC)
TPB/R/S/H5/28-7	YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse, WCDC Member
TPB/R/S/H5/28-8	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H5/28-9	陳樂行
TPB/R/S/H5/28-10	楊子雋
TPB/R/S/H5/28-11	Ho Wong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-12	Ng Yan Kit
TPB/R/S/H5/28-13	cleo wong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-14	sing chan
TPB/R/S/H5/28-15	Tiffany Tang
TPB/R/S/H5/28-16	Joan Shang
TPB/R/S/H5/28-17	Tam Daniel
TPB/R/S/H5/28-18	Adrian Ngan
TPB/R/S/H5/28-19	Ling Sun
TPB/R/S/H5/28-20	Liz Lau
TPB/R/S/H5/28-21	Dolphin
TPB/R/S/H5/28-22	Yvette Yanne
TPB/R/S/H5/28-23	Suzanne Wong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-24	張倩盈
TPB/R/S/H5/28-25	Tony Tong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-26	K.L. Ng
TPB/R/S/H5/28-27	Johnny Ng
TPB/R/S/H5/28-28	Arthur Yeung
TPB/R/S/H5/28-29	Tang Kin Tat
TPB/R/S/H5/28-30	Man Tou
TPB/R/S/H5/28-31	Mok Hiu Lam
TPB/R/S/H5/28-32	Yeung Kam Piu
TPB/R/S/H5/28-33	Yeung yat nam
TPB/R/S/H5/28-34	YK
TPB/R/S/H5/28-35	kiki wong

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/H5/28-36	Francisco Lo
TPB/R/S/H5/28-37	Gloria Ho
TPB/R/S/H5/28-38	蕭雲龍
TPB/R/S/H5/28-39	Siu Wan Chi
TPB/R/S/H5/28-40	Tinny Ko
TPB/R/S/H5/28-41	YU SAI TANG
TPB/R/S/H5/28-42	Wenda leung
TPB/R/S/H5/28-43	FUNG Wai Ching Ritter
TPB/R/S/H5/28-44	Victor Liu
TPB/R/S/H5/28-45	Lau Ting Shing
TPB/R/S/H5/28-46	Alex Leung
TPB/R/S/H5/28-47	Zita lo
TPB/R/S/H5/28-48	Currer Lui
TPB/R/S/H5/28-49	Sun Shun Kei
TPB/R/S/H5/28-50	Green Sense
TPB/R/S/H5/28-51	Ha Hung Siu
TPB/R/S/H5/28-52	姜玉菲
TPB/R/S/H5/28-53	Yu Wai Kwong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-54	Hazel
TPB/R/S/H5/28-55	Jasmine Tsang
TPB/R/S/H5/28-56	Chau Hei Suen
TPB/R/S/H5/28-57	Rainbow Kong
TPB/R/S/H5/28-58	Tam Mei Yuk
TPB/R/S/H5/28-59	Lau Pak Shing
TPB/R/S/H5/28-60	呂嘉怡
TPB/R/S/H5/28-61	蔡銀娟
TPB/R/S/H5/28-62	曾志雄
TPB/R/S/H5/28-63	羅少玲
TPB/R/S/H5/28-64	林寶泉
TPB/R/S/H5/28-65	麥浩俊
TPB/R/S/H5/28-66	陳卓楠
TPB/R/S/H5/28-67	黃秀屏
TPB/R/S/H5/28-68	陸燕容
TPB/R/S/H5/28-69	李雲珍
TPB/R/S/H5/28-70	杜秀芳
TPB/R/S/H5/28-71	Fato Leung
TPB/R/S/H5/28-72	李惠玲
TPB/R/S/H5/28-73	王翠合
TPB/R/S/H5/28-74	鄧小姐
TPB/R/S/H5/28-75	蔡少華

**List of Commenters in respect of
Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28**

提意見人名單
灣仔分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H5/28

Comment No. 意見編號	Name of 'Commenter' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C1	LAU Chun Kit
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C2	Yun Fan Lai
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C3	Dora Chan
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C4	Cecilia
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C5	Peter Wu
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C6	LAU Shun Wah Maggie
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C7	YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse, WCDC Member
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C8	Owners' Committee of One Wan Chai
TPB/R/S/H5/28 – C9	Mary Mulvihill

Provision of Major Community Facilities in Wan Chai District
在灣仔區提供的主要社區設施

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求(按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺(與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應(包括現有供應)	
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每40名12-17歲青少年設一個全日制學校課室	226 classrooms 個課室	450 classrooms 個課室	450 classrooms 個課室	+224 classrooms 個課室
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每25.5名6-11歲兒童設一個全日制學校課室	273 classrooms 個課室	443 classrooms 個課室	455 classrooms 個課室	+182 classrooms 個課室
Kindergarten and Nursery 幼兒班與幼稚園	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 每1,000名3-6歲以下幼童設34個課室	74 classrooms 個課室	214 classrooms 個課室	226 classrooms 個課室	+152 classrooms 個課室
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每200,000至500,000人設一間	0	1	1	+1
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每100,000至200,000人設一間	1	2	2	+1
Clinic/ Health Centre 普通科診療所/ 健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每100,000人設一間	2	3	3	+1
Specialist Clinic/ Polyclinic 專科診療所/ 分科診療所	1 whenever a regional or district hospital is built 每興建一所醫院，便應同時設置一所專科診療所/分科診療所	N/A 不適用	3	3	N/A 不適用
Hospital Beds 醫院床位	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每1,000人設5.5個床位	1,266 beds 個床位	1,942 beds 個床位	2,171 beds 個床位	+905 beds 個床位
Magistracy 裁判法院	1 per 660,000 persons 每660,000人設一間	0	1	1	+1
District Elderly Community Centres 長者地區中心	One in each new development area with a population of around 170 000 or above	N/A 不適用	2	2	N/A 不適用

	每個人口約為 170 000人或以上 的新發展區設一間				
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres 長者鄰舍中心	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15 000 to 20 000 persons, including both public and private housing 每個人口為 15 000 人至 20 000 人的新 建和重新發展的住宅 區(包括公營及私營 房屋)設一間	N/A 不適用	3	3	N/A 不適用
Day Care Centres/ Day Care Units^ (Centre-base) 長者日間護理 中心/長者日 間護理單位^ (以中心為本)	17.2 subsidised places per 1 000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~ ^ 每 1 000 名年滿 65歲或以上的長者 設17.2 個資助服務 名額~ ^	393	110	110	-283
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly 安老院舍	21.3 subsidised beds per 1 000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~ 每 1 000 名 65 歲 或以上 的長者設 21.3 個資助床位~	1,217	923 ^Δ	1,047 ^Ω	-170
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre 綜合青少年服 務中心	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 每 12,000 名 6-24歲兒童/青年 設一間	2	2	2	0
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務 中心	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons 每100,000至150,000 人設一間	1	1	1	0
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons# 每100,000人10公頃#	18.45 ha 公頃	36 ha 公頃	40.36 ha 公頃	+21.91 ha 公頃
Local Open Space 鄰舍休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons# 每100,000人10公頃#	18.45 ha 公頃	14.89 ha 公頃	15.83 ha 公頃	-2.62 ha 公頃
Sports Centre 體育中心	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons 每50,000至65,000 人 設一個	2	3	3	+1
Sports Ground/ Sports Complex 運動場/ 運動場館	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons 每200,000 至250,000 人設一個	0	4	4	+4

Swimming Pool Complex – Standard 游泳池場館 – 標準池	1 complex per 287,000 persons 每287,000人設一個場館	0	2	2	+2
Post Office 郵政局	Accessible within 1.2 km in urban area 在市區設於1.2公里的範圍內	N/A 不適用	7	7	N/A 不適用

Note 註：

The planned population of the Wan Chai District is about 230,358
灣仔區的規劃人口約為 230,358 人

The requirements excludes planned population of transients and the provision is based on the information as at March 2018
有關要求不包括流動居民，供應所根據的資料為截至2018年3月

Δ Provided by Social Welfare Department
由社會福利署提供

Ω Included the provision at a site in Ventris Road
包括於雲地利道用地提供的設施

~ This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate
此乃長遠目標，在規劃和發展過程中，社會福利署會就實際提供的服務作出適當考慮

^ The facilities belong to the centre-based facilities of Community Care Services (CCS). The planning standard of the CCS Facilities (including both centre-based and home-based) is population-based. There is no rigid distribution between centre-based CCS and home-based CCS stated in the Elderly Services Programme Plan. Nonetheless, in general, 60% of CCS demand will be provided by home-based CCS and the remaining 40% will be provided by centre-based CCS
這些設施屬於以中心為本的社區護理服務。社區照顧服務設施(包括中心為本及家居為本)的規劃標準是以人口為基礎。《安老服務計劃方案》對中心為本及家居為本的社區照顧服務的分配沒有硬性的規定。不過，一般來說，家居為本的服務及中心為本的服務分別滿足六成和四成社區照顧服務方面的需求